



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,484	01/06/2004	Yun-hwa Choi	Q77658	3548
23373	7590	03/13/2007	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			AHN, SAM K	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			2611	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/13/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	10/751,484	Applicant(s)	CHOI, YUN-HWA
Examiner	Sam K. Ahn	Art Unit	2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2004.
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 January 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 072506.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 4,9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 4, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 6, recites "a timing controller for generating a timing control signal..." while claim 6 recites "a baseband controller ... for generating a timing control signal...". Claim 9 also recites that the baseband controller comprises a timing controller. In this case, does this mean that the timing controller is generating the same "timing control signal" that is recited in claim 6? Or, is it a different timing control signal? The claim limitation is unclear and indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 10 directly depends on claim 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1,2,5,11,12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Richards et al. US 6,539,213 (Richards).

Regarding claim 1, Richards teaches an ultra wideband (UWB) transceiver (see 702,602 in Fig.11), comprising: a receiver (702) configured to calculate channel information (1011 providing information of signal strength, received noise and SNR, note col.15, lines 55-57) from a UWB pulse signal (708) received over a UWB channel (706, wireless channel) so that a UWB channel condition can be predicted and a data transmission scheme is changed according to the calculated channel information (transmission scheme using different power control is adjusted based on the SNR, note col.21, lines 29-35, wherein the channel condition is predicted based on propagation path between transceivers in bilateral symmetric communication, note col.21, lines 50-60), whereby information transmission can be efficiently made according to the UWB channel condition (UWB channel condition having a certain path loss, note col.21, lines 50-54, is determined and power control is adjusted accordingly in 1808A in Fig.18).

Regarding claim 2, Richards further teaches wherein at least one of a channel coding rate, modulation order and transmission power is selectively changed according to the data transmission scheme (transmission power control is changed, 1808A in Fig.18).

Regarding claim 5, Richards further teaches wherein the channel information is a signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) calculated from the received UWB pulse signal (note col.15, line 56, calculated from the signal received via 704 in Fig.11).

Regarding claim 11, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 1 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 12, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 2 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 15, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 5 with similar scope.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards et al. US 6,539,213 (Richards) in view of Ozluturk et al. US 7,072,380 B2.

Regarding claim 3, Richards teaches all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 2. And although Richards teaches coded pulse trains (404 in Fig.4) wherein one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would recognize that signals generated by the transmitter of Richards are encoded by a certain code rate, Richards does not explicitly teach a definition of a channel coding rate.

Ozluturk teaches that the channel coding rate is a ratio of the number of information bits to that of the total bits including the information bits and redundant bits that are added for reliable data transmission during coding through a channel encoder (note col.45, lines 12-23). Hence, Ozluturk teaches that a convolutional encoder enables use of forward error correction techniques in order to detect and correct errors (note col.45, lines 12-19). Both Richards and Ozluturk teaches encoding of a signal to be decoded later by its respective receivers wherein Ozluturk further suggests implementing convolution encoder. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Ozluturk in the system of Richards by implementing the convolution encoder in the encoding scheme of Richards to create the signal as illustrated in Fig.4 for the purpose of enabling use of forward error correction techniques in order to detect and correct errors (note col.45, lines 12-19).

Regarding claim 13, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 3 with similar scope.

Assuming applicant overcomes the 112, 2nd paragraph rejection as set forth above, the rejection is as follows:

4. Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards et al. US 6,539,213 (Richards) in view of Dress, Jr. et al. US 6,603,818 (Dress).

Regarding claim 4, Richards teaches all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 2. And although Richards teaches wherein the modulation scheme is implemented in a modulator to modulate data (note col.8, lines 22-46) using variety of different types of modulation schemes, Richards does not explicitly teach wherein 4-PSK, 8-PSK and 16-PSK scheme is employed.

Dress teaches a UWB transceiver implementing different types of modulation schemes including QPSK (note col.9, line 24), wherein one skilled in the art the time the invention was made would recognize that 4-PSK, 8-PSK and 16-PSK scheme is part of the same family of PSK. Hence, both Richards and Dress teach a UWB transceiver employing a variety of modulation schemes, wherein Dress further suggests implementing QPSK modulation scheme and also teaches that modulation scheme may be selected depending on application needs (note col.9, lines 22-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Dress in the system of Richards by implementing QPSK, 4-PSK, 8-PSK or 16-PSK or any other types of modulation schemes for the purpose of using modulation scheme that suits its application needs, as taught by Dress (note col.9, lines 22-29).

Regarding claim 14, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 4 with similar scope.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards et al. US 6,539,213 (Richards) in view of Barnes et al. US 2002/0175850 (Barnes).

Regarding claim 6, Richards teaches all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 1. Richards further teaches the UWB transceiver comprising: a transmitter (602 in Fig.11) including a processing means for modulating predetermined information into a UWB pulse signal and transmitting the modulated signal over the UWB channel by using a data transmission scheme determined according to the channel information (according to Signal evaluation 1011, UWB pulse signal output 618 is transmitted and configured by control signals 1122 and output of 1126); and a baseband controller (1014,1126) connected to the transmitter (602) and the receiver (702), respectively, and extracting the channel information from the receiver and forwarding the channel information to the transmitter (extracted channel information 1106,1108 and 1110 is provided to the transmitter via 1126 and 1014); wherein the receiver includes a processing means for receiving the UWB pulse signal over the UWB channel and calculating the channel information capable of predicting the UWB channel condition, thereby obtaining original binary information (739 is obtained, and wherein the further limitation is as explained in regards to claim 1). However, Richards does not explicitly teach generating a timing control signal for synchronization between the transmitter and receiver.

Barnes teaches a UWB transceiver (see Fig.6) wherein a timing control signal is provided to both transmitter and receiver (605 providing timing control signal 607 to the transmitter 601 and receiver). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the baseband controller generates the timing control signal for synchronization between the transmitter and the receiver. Applicant has not disclosed that the timing control signal for synchronization between the transmitter and the receiver provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the Richards of having a separate control signal for the transmitter (from 604) and the receiver (from 718) because the timing control signal for the receiver is adaptively changed based on the received signal itself (through lock loop filter 742). On the other hand, one skilled in the art would recognize that the teaching of Barnes teaches a timing control signal for both transmitter and receiver (605 providing timing control signal 607 to the transmitter 601 and receiver) wherein one skilled in the art would recognize that the transmitter and the receiver would be in synchronization as timing is controlled by a common control signal. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify the system of Richards with teaching of Barnes to obtain the invention as specified in the claim.

6. Claims 7-10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards et al. US 6,539,213 (Richards) in view of Barnes et al. US 2002/0175850 (Barnes) and Takamura US 2003/0035465.

Regarding claim 7, Richards in view of Barnes teach all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 6. Richards further teaches a channel encoder for performing channel coding for the information to be transmitted at a predetermined channel coding rate to be suitable for transmission over the UWB channel (transmitting predetermined coded signals 404 in Fig.4 over wireless UWB channel 706); a modulator for modulating the information coded by the channel encoder into the UWB pulse signal in an analog format with a predetermined modulation order (implementing predetermined modulation schemes, note col.8, lines 22-46, wherein one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would recognize that encoders are coupled to a modulator during signal transmission, and also note col.11, lines 45-46).

Although Richards teaches wherein the power control signal is provided to a pulse generator (622 receiving power control signal from 1126 in Fig.11), Richards in view of Barnes do not explicitly teach an amplifier for adjusting transmission power of the UWB pulse signal output from the modulator to be suitable for the UWB channel transmission.

Takamura teaches a UWB transmitter (see Fig.3) comprising a pulse generator (804) wherein the pulse generator further comprises an amplifier (804-2) and the power or the amplification factor is adjusted (note paragraph 0037). Hence, both

Richards and Takamura teach a UWB transmitter comprising a pulse generator receiving a power control signal to adjust its respective transmitting power wherein Takamura further suggests that the pulse generator comprising the amplifier is adjusted. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that the pulse generator of Richards includes an amplifier as taught by Takamura for the purpose of controlling and providing pulses adjusted based on the amplification factor (note paragraph 0037).

Regarding claim 8, Richards further teaches wherein the receiver (see 702 in Fig.11) comprises: a correlation detector for calculating the channel information from the UWB pulse signal received over the UWB channel (correlator 710, note col.15, line 32 coupled to 1011 to provide channel information 1106,1108,1110); and a decoder for decoding a data sequence of the UWB pulse signal into an original signal (738 in Fig.11, wherein one skilled in the art would recognize that the encoded signals are decoded in order to provide received data, 739).

Regarding claim 9, Richards further teaches a channel information processor for extracting the channel information calculated by the receiver and forwarding the channel information to the transmitter (1011 providing power control to the transmitter via 1126); and a timing controller for generating a timing control signal for synchronization between the transmitter and receiver and transmitting the

timing control signal to a timing synchronizer (wherein this limitation is explained as applied to claim 6 performed by the baseband controller.

Regarding claim 10, Richards further teaches the baseband controller further comprises a power controller (1126) for generating another control signal (output of 1126) according to the channel information extracted by the channel information processor and controlling transmission power of the UWB pulse signal (based on the channel information 1106,1108,1110, power control signal is generated, as previously explained).

Regarding claim 17, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 8 with similar scope.

7. Claim 1~~6~~ is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards et al. US 6,539,213 (Richards) in view of Walker et al. US 2004/0048574 A1 (Walker).

Regarding claim 16, Richards teaches all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 11. And although Richards teaches channel coding and implementing different types of modulation, as previously explained, Richards does not explicitly teach wherein the information transmission scheme performs channel coding for information at a lowest channel coding rate and determines modulation thereof with a lowest modulation order if the information to be transmitted comprises an initial transmission signal.

Walker teaches computing for channel configuration or channel state in a wireless UWB channel between transceivers (see Fig. 19) and different information transmission schemes are computed, implemented within the transceiver and even further informed to different transceivers (modulation types and channel coding rate is adjusted accordingly, note paragraphs 0153 and col. 18, right column, lines 31-33). Hence, both Richards and Walker teach UWB transceivers wherein Walker further suggests that depending on the channel condition, modulation types and channel coding rate are adjusted in order to perform adaptive signal transmission based on channel condition (note paragraph 0014). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Walker in the system of Richards by adjusting modulation types and channel coding rate for the purpose of adjusting signal transmission based on channel condition (note paragraph 0014).

And further, although Richards in view of Walker do not explicitly teach wherein lowest channel coding rate and lowest order of modulation types are implemented for initial transmission signal, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement as such. Applicant has not disclosed that such implementation provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose or solves a stated problem.


One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with other than the lowest because the type of

channel coding and modulation types are dependent on user needs and channel condition. If the user of the equipment only desires minimal data rate during initial transmission, one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would recognize that lowest channel coding rate and lowest order of modulation type is suitable and be performed as such. On the other hand, if the user requirement is to have a high data rate during initial transmission, highest channel coding rate and highest order of modulation type should be implemented. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify the teaching of Richards in view of Walker to obtain the invention as specified in the claim.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Ahn whose telephone number is (571) 272-3044. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Sam K. Ahn
Patent Examiner